

Docket No. 59614 (49381)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT: Y. Kikuoka CONF. NO.: 4208
U.S. SERIAL NO.: 10/622,273 EXAMINER: D. Dicker
FILED: July 17, 2003 GROUP: 2625
FOR: IMAGE INFORMATION DISTRIBUTING METHOD, IMAGE INFORMATION DISTRIBUTING SYSTEM, CENTRAL APPARATUS, TERMINAL APPARATUS, SCANNER APPARATUS, AND COMPUTER MEMORY PRODUCT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action dated April 16, 2008 of the above-identified application.

Claims 1-12, 14, 17-25, 27-30, 32, 34, and 35 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 5, 12, 14, 17, 18, 25, 27, 30, 28, 29, 34, and 35 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2003/0115277 to Watanabe et al. ("Watanabe"). Claim 32 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of U.S. Patent 7,028,075 to Morris. The remaining claims were rejected on combinations involving the Watanabe reference. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 1 over Watanabe, the Watanabe reference does not teach or suggest that a summary document includes **both** location information specifying a location where image information is stored and summary image information, and that a summary email is generated including this information.

Watanabe is directed to a network service system in which a user A can access images via a center server 12, and specify a particular image that the user A wants to transmit to user B, where the center server 12 generates an email to which the specified image is attached and transmits the generated email to the user B (see, e.g., paragraph 0070 of Watanabe).

On page 3 of the Office Action of 04/16/2008, paragraph 0071 and FIG. 5 of Watanabe were cited allegedly for teaching "generating a summary document," and paragraphs 0066 and 0072 of Watanabe were cited allegedly for teaching that the summary document includes "location information indicative of a location in which said image information is stored."

FIG. 5 of Watanabe, as described in paragraph 0071, is an example of a screen display used for preparing an email for transmission of thumbnail images. For example, as described in paragraphs 0071-0073, the user can select various images, and these images appear in an email depicted in FIG. 6. The images are converted to text format, and a WWW application server 15 generates an "image-attached electronic mail message" (see paragraph 0074 of Watanabe). Subsequently, as described in paragraph 0075, the email is transmitted.

As described in paragraph 0072 of Watanabe, the IDs of selected images are obtained in order to attach the correct images to the email. However, there is no teaching or suggestion that these IDs or "location information" of the images are included in the email.

In Watanabe, the image ID is transmitted from user A, who is a requester, to the center server 12 in order to specify a desired image (see, e.g., paragraph 0070 of Watanabe). However, the email 29 transmitted from the center server to user B does not include the image ID (see, e.g., FIG. 3 of Watanabe).

According to a second embodiment of Watanabe, an address of an image file is transmitted, instead of a thumbnail image (see paragraph 0077; and FIG. 7).

However, there is simply no teaching or suggestion in Watanabe that **both** (1) "location information indicative of a location in which said image information is stored," and (2) summary image information are included in a summary document transmitted to a terminal apparatus.

Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in Watanabe of generating a summary email by attaching a generated summary document including **both** location information and summary image information.

For at least the reasons discussed above, the Watanabe reference does not anticipate or otherwise render obvious the Applicant's claimed invention, whether taken alone or in combination with the Morris reference. Therefore, independent claim 1 and its respective dependent claims are patentable over Watanabe and/or Morris. Similarly, the other independent claims and their respective claims are patentable over Watanabe and/or Morris.

It is believed the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven M. Jensen/

Date: July 16, 2008

Steven M. Jensen
(Reg. No. 42,693)
Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205

Phone: (617) 239-0100

Customer No. 21874